



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,946	06/23/2003	James M. Adams	144237	7832
31248	7590	11/16/2005	EXAMINER	
ANTHONY F. MATHENY ANDREWS & KURTH L.L.P. 600 TRAVIS SUITE 4200 HOUSTON, TX 77002			SMITH, MATTHEW J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3672	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,946	ADAMS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew J. Smith	3672	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Final rejection

 (1) Matthew J. Smith, examiner.

(3) _____.

 (2) Anthony Matheny, attorney.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 November 2005
Time: 11:45a E
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 103 rejection

Claims discussed:

21-31

Prior art documents discussed:

Herd et al 3974875; Reynolds 6530430

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

DAVID BAGNELL
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

4

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Matheny contacted examiner Smith on 8 Nov. Examiner Smith responded 9 Nov. and discussed the rejection motivation to combine, i.e., the question of admitted prior art. After further review, the examiner contacted Mr. Matheny on Nov. 10 and concurred the motivation to combine is considered hindsight and no other motivation to combine is found in Reynolds. At this point, the claims may be considered objected to, but the examiner noted an updated search and a peer review have not been completed..